



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,870	02/27/2004	Vadim Fux	555255012558	7232

24325 7590 07/03/2006

STEPHEN D. SCANLON
JONES DAY
901 LAKESIDE AVENUE
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

PATEL, MANGLES M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/788,870	Applicant(s) FUX ET AL.	
	Examiner Manglesh M. Patel	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/15/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This **Non-Final** action is responsive to communications: IDS filed on Sep 15, 2004 to the application filed on 02/27/04.
2. Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 18-19 and 22 are independent claims

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on Sep 15, 2004 has been entered, and considered by the examiner.

Drawings

4. The Drawings filed on 02/27/04 have been approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teshima (U.S. 6,687,879, filed on Jul 8, 1999).

Regarding Independent claims 1, 18, Teshima discloses a system for facilitating the processing of font data for electronic data transfers to client devices, comprising: A client font list store comprising a list of client font capabilities associated with one or more client devices (abstract,

Art Unit: 2178

column 1, lines 35-67, wherein the table includes a client font list for a client device which is the storage device used to store the font/text relationships); and font processing software stored in a computer readable medium and comprising processor executable instructions that are operable to cause a processing device to receive an electronic data transfer addressed to at least one client device, the at least one client device corresponding to the one or more client devices, determine augment font data by accessing font data in the electronic data transfer and comparing the accessed font data to the list of client font capabilities associated with the one or more client devices, and to include the augment font data in the electronic data transfer to the at least one client device (column 1, lines 35-67 & column 2, lines 35-67, wherein the font software is in a storage device). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 2, with dependency of claim 1, Teshima discloses wherein the font processing software further comprises processor executable instructions that are operable to cause a processing device to request the list of client font capabilities from the one or more client devices and store the list of client font capabilities received in response in the client font list store (column 5, lines 15-55). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a

Art Unit: 2178

device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 3, with dependency of claim 1, Teshima discloses wherein the one or more client devices comprises mobile communication devices (column 4, lines 20-67).

Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 4, with dependency of claim 3, Teshima discloses wherein the electronic data transfer comprises an electronic document (column 4, lines 20-67). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 5, with dependency of claim 3, Teshima discloses wherein the electronic data transfer comprise a Wireless Access Protocol (WAP) deck (column 4, lines 20-67). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 6, with dependency of claim 1, Teshima discloses wherein the list of client font capabilities associated with one or more client devices comprises a list of fonts supported by each of the one or more client devices (column 9, lines 35-67). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 7, with dependency of claim 1, Teshima discloses wherein the font processing software is executed on a server computer having stored font data (column 5, lines 1-

Art Unit: 2178

35). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 8, with dependency of claim 7, Teshima discloses wherein the font processing software further comprises processor executable instructions that are operable to cause the server computer to request and receive augment font data from an augment font provider if the augment font data is not included in the stored font data (column 7, lines 15-60). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 9, with dependency of claim 1, Teshima discloses: a server font data store comprising server font data for a plurality of font types (column 2, lines 20-67); and a provider font list store comprising font provider access data (column 4, lines 15-60); wherein the processor executable instructions are operable to cause a processing device access the server font

Art Unit: 2178

data store to obtain augment font data and to access the provider font list store to issue a request to a font provider to obtain augment font data (column 15, lines 25-60). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Independent claim 10, Teshima discloses a method of facilitating the processing of font data for electronic data transfers to client devices, comprising: storing a list of client font capabilities associated with one or more client devices (abstract, column 1, lines 35-67, wherein the font table includes a list of fonts for a device); accessing font data in an electronic data transfer addressed to at least one client device, the at least one client device corresponding to the one or more client devices (column 1, lines 35-67 & column 2, lines 35-67, wherein the font data is accessed by the font client device which is stored in a storage device); comparing the accessed font data to the list of client font capabilities associated with the one or more client devices (column 14, lines 20-60, wherein the font device includes an operation for comparing of the font data selected/supported to the font data stored in the storage device); identifying augment font data based on the comparing the accessed font data to the list of client font capabilities associated with the one or more client devices (column 14, lines 5-50, wherein, wherein the font data is identified by the client font device by a selection mode); and including augment font data in the

Art Unit: 2178

electronic data transfer to the at least one client device (column 11, lines 35-60, wherein the electronic data transfer between the storage device and the font device include augmenting the font data). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 11, with dependency of claim 10, Teshima discloses requesting the list of client font capabilities from the one or more client devices (column 1, lines 35-67 & column 2 lines 35-67). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 12, with dependency of claim 10, Teshima discloses wherein the one or more client devices comprise mobile communication devices (column 1, lines 35-67 & column 2, lines 35-67). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a

Art Unit: 2178

device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 13, with dependency of claim 12, Teshima discloses wherein the electronic data transfer comprises an electronic document (column 1, lines 35-67). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 14, with dependency of claim 12, Teshima discloses wherein the electronic data transfer comprises a Wireless Access Protocol (WAP) deck (column 1, lines 35-67). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 15, with dependency of claim 12, Teshima discloses wherein the electronic data transfer comprises an e-mail message (column 1, lines 35-67 & column 4, lines 15-55). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 16, with dependency of claim 10, Teshima discloses wherein storing a list of client font capabilities associated with one or more client devices comprises storing a list of fonts supported by each of the one or more client devices (column 3, lines 20-50). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 17, with dependency of claim 10, Teshima discloses: determining if the augment font data is stored in a font data store (column 3, lines 20-50); and requesting

Art Unit: 2178

augment font data from an augment font provider if the augment font data if the augment font data is not stored in the font data store (column 3, lines 20-50). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Independent claim 19, Teshima discloses a method of facilitating the processing of font data in electronic messages addressed to one or more client devices, comprising: determining client font capabilities associated with the one or more client devices (column 4, lines 20-60, wherein the client font device includes determining of the font capabilities by supporting the various selection modes associated with the font in the storage device); receiving an electronic message addressed to at least one client device, the at least one client device corresponding to the one or more client devices (column 4, lines 22-67, wherein the message includes the request for the mode associated with the font from the storage device); accessing font data in the electronic message (column 10, lines 40-67, wherein the font data that is stored in the storage device is accessed by the font device); comparing the accessed font data to the client font capabilities associated with the one or more client devices (column 6, lines 20-67, wherein the data in the storage device and the font device are compared to determine the mode supported on the font device); identifying augment font data based on the comparing the

Art Unit: 2178

accessed font data to the client font capabilities associated with the one or more client devices (column 3, lines 20-40, wherein the augment font data is identified and compared when accessed by the font device); including augment font data in the electronic message addressed to the at least one client device to create a font-augmented electronic message (column 9, lines 35-60, wherein a font-augmented message is created from the font client device); and transmitting the font-augmented electronic message to the at least one client device (column 9, Lines 35-60, wherein the font-augmented message is transmitted to the font device from the font storage device). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 20, with dependency of claim 19, Teshima discloses wherein the determining client font capabilities associated with one or more client devices comprises receiving a list of client font capabilities from each of the one or more client devices (column 12, lines 20-55). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device

thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 21, with dependency of claim 20, Teshima discloses wherein the one or more client devices are mobile communication devices (column 12, lines 45-67). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Independent claim 22, Teshima discloses a method of facilitating the processing of font data in an electronic message addressed to a mobile device, comprising: receiving an electronic message (column 11, lines 20-60, wherein a message including the font data is received by the client font device); determining if the electronic message includes a font attachment including augment font data (column 8, lines 1-20, wherein the augment font data is determined for a selected mode of the font client device); and upon determining that the electronic message includes a font attachment including augment font data, automatically storing the augment font data in a client font data store (column 9, lines 10-45, wherein the augment font data is automatically stored in the client font device once the augment font data is determined). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a

mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

Regarding Dependent claim 23, with dependency of claim 22, Teshima discloses communicating a notification of the automatic storing of the font data in the client font data store to a font server (column 7, lines 40-67). Teshima fails to explicitly teach the determining of the client font abilities but it would have been obvious to make a determination of the fonts supported by a device. To be able to select a mode from the font selection device associated with the font in the storage device it would have to include support for that font (column 2, lines 1-40). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the selection of a mode by determining the font supported for a device thereby allowing the association of text modes with the fonts.

*It is noted that any citation **[[s]]** to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. **[[See, MPEP 2123]]***

Conclusion

Other Prior Art Cited

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


- Igarashi (U.S. 5,740,462) discloses "Output Apparatus Permitting Font Selection Based On Resolutions"

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W 6 am-3 pm T, TH 6 am-2pm, Fr 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner
June 26, 2006


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER